

*Remarks*Rejections Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 9 has been amended so that it depends from claim 8 as was originally intended. This cures the antecedent basis problem regarding the second spring.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 13 and 16 have been amended such that all references to a third protrusion now speak of a second protrusion. This cures the antecedent basis problem regarding the third protrusion.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 14 has been amended to change the reference to a fourth protrusion to a reference to a third protrusion. This cures the antecedent basis problem regarding the fourth protrusion.

Rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103

The office action indicated that claims 2, 3, 8-17 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 19 (and claim 19 has been canceled). Because the amendment renders claim 1 allowable, and because all other claims depend ultimately from claim 1, all claims are in condition for allowance.

Drawings

The drawings that were submitted on 10/31/2003 were informal. Applicant submits formal drawings herewith to replace the informal drawings originally filed.

Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 10/23/2006

Kevin M. Hart

Reg. No. 36,823